DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 743 HE 004 237

TITLE	Report of the Special Committee for Development of Communication with Negro Colleges and Universities, 1971-72.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Berkeley. Special Committee for Development of Communication with Negro Colleges and Universities.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Annual Reports; *Committees; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Higher Education; *Human Development; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Negro Colleges

ABSTRACT

This document is the 1971-72 annual report of the Special Committee for Development of Communications with Negro Colleges and Universities (SCDCNCU). This report conveys, in explicit terms the nature and the implications of the SCDCNCU approach to human and social development. An overview of the year's progress, persons' contacted throughout the year, process in course, and the immediate future of the committee are highlighted. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR
DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATION WITH
NEGRO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

ED 078743

1971-72

Report of the

SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT

OF COMMUNICATION

WITH

NEGRO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

University of California

Berkeley

- o The Year In-The-Large
- o The People of the Year
- o Process in Course
- o The (Immediate!) Future

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 237

The Year In-The-Large

This has been a troubled year everywhere. Just about every campus--playing its part in the symphony of the nation--has bucked and reared and succumbed to its portion of cutback and turn-around. In consequence, the burdens on individual shoulders have everywhere grown heavier, and, following from this, old commitments of time and energy have retracted and new ones died in birth. The same old deception, on cue, at work again: hard times upon us, and the individual therefore turns away from others, thinking thus to find his oppressed self for the tender and supportive ministrations it requires. The self is not there:--we are simply veering into another cycle of the old traditional pattern of make-do, make-do until a significant sector of the society comes to unendurable agony over the unworkability of the social values; measured tolerance of a soft explosion; the foot put down; and then make-do, make-do again.

Institutions, too, in times like these, turn away from others and into themselves. Flourishing schools can tolerate such involution for even longish periods, because they actually ride on the myriad individual and personal relationships of their members that extend outside the schools' own walls. But emerging schools risk suicide in emulating the others in this. The isolation leaves them cut off from seeds and increments of promising innovation, from spontaneous objective criticism, from the countless developmental opportunities that come along only in the flesh of interrelationship and can never be intentionally created. In these times of hurt and diminishment the developing colleges, and the established schools, need more than ever the presence and the building of rich ties of individual interrelation. The field of minority school emergence and growth needs our SCDCNCU Program now more than ever.

Because of the greater burden that everyone associated with a school carries these days, participation in our Program this past year has been somewhat less than in previous years. We are--each of us--only one human being and we can do only so much in a given social context. But we have at the same time been getting a broader and broader show of interest in our Program. Operationally expressed, this means that if suddenly tomorrow things were to change, and members of major faculties, and others associated with their schools, were to have the freedom to take up and pursue new involvements, we could enlist the activity of more of these people at this moment than at any moment in the past. A great deal of the increased consciousness of our activities results from the appearance of our new magazine, INTERMEDIUM (about which more below). All in all the year may be said to have found us doing our thing as usual, while it, for its part, was shifting ground on us, presenting us with significantly altered conditions. The immediate future will find us learning how to cope with these different conditions and so continuing to provide fulfillment of the never-ending need for productive relationship.

The appearance of INTERMEDIUM on the scene has had a first impact that is everything we could have wished it to be. We have had enthusiastic appreciations of the specific articles in the first issue, and excited estimations--corroborating our own--of the potential importance of this magazine. Many new persons and organizations have contacted us for the first time, expressing keen interest in receiving the magazine and our reports, and in

participating with us. We feel ourselves still very new in publishing: we are only beginning to build up to tapping the vast sources of authorship. But new as we are, we cannot help but recognize the evidence--which comes like bell-clanging and trumpet-blaring--that we are providing a most valuable communications service. We have begun to prepare the second issue of INTERMEDIUM and we hope to see it in print this Fall or Winter.

Our annual meeting took a form this year somewhat different from the usual. We held a retreat at Asilomar Conference Grounds on the Monterey Peninsula over the weekend of March 11-12, 1972. Our motivation to this was precisely the heavy year and the heavy times we and our Program were living through, and which would, therefore, warrant not just discussion, but discussion, thought and discussion. And it did prove to be a couple of days of very profitable discussion, thought and discussion. Indeed, it could not have been otherwise; for we had in attendance not only immediate members of the Committee, but also Gordon K. Davies of Stockton State College in Pomona, New Jersey (past Director of the Harvard-Yale-Columbia Intensive Summer Studies Program), George A. Ferguson of Howard University (long-time friend and participant with us), James H. M. Henderson of Tuskegee Institute (Director of the Carver Research Foundation, and a "charter participant" in our Program), and Tobe Johnson of Morehouse College (Coordinator of the Afro-American Studies Program of the Atlanta University Center, and friend and helper to our Program over many years). Members of the Committee present at the retreat were Laetsch, Mackinney, Morrison, Takahashi, and Barankin. And Anne Dorst (who made all the arrangements, from A to Z) was there with her busy pencil. Much valuable exchange took place over these two days. Warranting particular mention here is the idea that came forward of our creating an Eastern branch or counterpart of our Committee, which would have a predominantly black membership. It is our intention to pursue this idea into realization as soon as possible.

The People of the Year

Mildred Alexander and Doris Smith are two of the stalwarts of Berkeley's School of Social Welfare. In May they spanned the distance into Alabama and created ties with Talladega and Tuskegee. It was Carrie Allen McCray, Associate Director of the Undergraduate Social Work Program at Talladega, who graciously and most effectively facilitated the bridging at the Alabama end.

Reports of the visit are glowing with things it is good to hear, for example the high percentage of Talladega's graduates who qualify for graduate training at major universities and who go on to higher degrees, and the lessons that a small school like Talladega has to teach regarding the benefits of closer student-teacher contact. At Tuskegee (where our visitors cooperated in some proposal drafting) there was the opportunity to see the development of a social work program in a much larger context of human services. Alexander and Smith report, too, that ACHE (the Alabama Center for Higher Education (see the first issue of INTERMEDIUM)) and ACDHE (the Alabama Consortium for Development of Higher Education) are functioning quite substantially and effecting many benefits to social work programs throughout the state.

John Cotton, of the Graduate School of Education and the Department of Psychology at UC-Santa Barbara, came up to spend the day, May 23, at D.-Q. University. We connected at Berkeley and all drove the round-trip to Davis. (Incidentally, "D.-Q. University" is now the official name of the school that started out calling itself "Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University." The change is in deference to a request made by the Iroquois Indians.) D.-Q. has been considering the possibility of having graduate interns working for periods on the campus in order to develop curricula. Cotton and Santa Barbara may be able to bring valuable cooperation to such a program.

It is always with a special pleasure that we come to talk about Tuskegee Institute in our Annual Reports. The reason is that we always see such vigorous growth activity at this school. Pick any instant and examine what's going on there, either from reportage or in person on a visit to the campus: you find humming activity; you find individuals tingling with new ideas and their undertaking; you find eagerness for and high motivation to discussion and comment on their newnesses; you find an almost superhuman thrust after, welcome of, and delight in change; and you find--perhaps the single most important thing--that Tuskegee has evidently succeeded in penetrating to the key for preserving, against the destructive competitive human forces, the healthy gestation, birth and upbringing of an innovation. Our special pleasure is in being associated with this unusual creative energy, in being participants in it and in taking inspiration from it.

One of the principal bundles of energy at Tuskegee has been Johnnie W. Prothro, as Head of the Department of Home Economics and Food Administration. (Prothro is now, since Fall of 1972, in the new position of Deputy Chief, R & D

Branch, Nutrition Program, Center for Communicable Diseases, Atlanta.) She has been prominent in our past Annual Reports, and is so again this year. Her department is currently phasing out its straight dietetic internship and is developing a coordinated program in general dietetics. The Medical Center and School of Home Economics of the University of Missouri at Columbia, Missouri, has one of the four such coordinated programs in the U. S. at present. Another of these is at Ohio State University in Columbus. Prothro had her staff, under our auspices, visit and observe these two established programs, the better to guide their efforts in building their own program. Prothro and Neal Goodwin (Professor of Hospital Dietetics:--another old-timer with us) visited Columbia, Missouri, on December 6-8, 1971. They note that they consulted there particularly with Drs. Christine Weaver, Marian Spears, Aimee Moore and Margaret Mangel. Another of Prothro's colleagues, Lillie S. Hicks (Therapeutic Dietetics), visited Columbus, Ohio, on May 3-5, 1972. In addition to fruitful consultations with Ohio State staff, she had the benefit of the Medical Dietetics Conference that was being held there during that time.

But our cooperation this year with Prothro and her department's curricular reformation began back in June of 1971, when Bernadine Tolbert, a new Assistant Professor of Nutrition in Prothro's department, spent ten days in Berkeley and vicinity. She consulted particularly with Doris Calloway and some of her colleagues in Berkeley's Department of Nutritional Sciences on the formulation of laboratory components for undergraduate nutrition courses; and--again through Calloway's intercession--she visited a number of sites in the Bay Area to observe research experiences in several dietetic internships. Toward the end of her stay she was able to take in the biochemical meetings being then held in San Francisco.

Those who follow closely the doings of our Program know that what is different and distinctive about us is our uncompromising insistence on the creation of <u>process</u>; our (by now well-verified) thesis that there is a much greater bounty of space-time-localizable points of achievement to be gained, at far less cost, by encouraging into existence, and nurturing, the full-blown interpersonal processes that can spontaneously spawn this achievement, rather than by targeting directly on such achievement points and utilizing remunerated human beings to attempt the accomplishment of these points. The work of our Program is, accordingly, best exemplified when the facts in a case

permit us to present concisely a fairly full account of the evolutionary substance of the case. We have such a case in the instance of the now-building cooperation between the Departments of Philosophy at Tuskegee and the Irvine campus of the University of California. ("Tuskegee-Irvine-philosophy-now-connection" is the space-time-point of achievement that is involved. But to report only this, and say nothing about the process within which it came to be, is to leave the earnest reader without any instruction as to how we arranged to arrive at this achievement. For, it was neither an accident nor a preplanned intention. It is, rather, the typical consequence of succeeding in setting in motion a creative, productive, interpersonal process. That, indeed, is the properly counted achievement of our Committee's work: the success in getting going--and helping to maintain--such a process.)

It is back in October, 1970, that the story begins. At that time Peter W. Woodruff, of the Department of Philsophy at Irvine, telephoned the Committee office in Berkeley to say that he and his Department had learned of the Committee's work and wished to become active with us. That was the Committee's signal to do at least two things: (i) to get to know Woodruff personally, and him to know us similarly; and (ii) to start to keep a trained eye out for a philosophy focus on a black college campus that might connect well with Woodruff and his colleagues. (From the Committee's point of view this was an unusually exciting possibility raised; for, we had not before come anywhere near the field of philsophy as one demanding current attention for the goal of educational enhancement of the black colleges. No sign of concern in this field had come from these campuses themselves, and our attention too was naturally tending to dwell on the "hard," "solid" subjects. But time moves and there is progress. And this is exactly why our present story goes on to tell of a vibrant connection come to pass. Moreover, it is very much of the nature of our Program that our involvement in the field of philosophy did not spring from the contemplative forehead of the Committee sitting in ponderous planning (--one of the traditional ego-serving fictions that interfere with full creativity--), but rather arose very naturally, of itself, in the flow of the process we are involved in.) In April-May of 1971 Barankin visited Talladega College and there learned that Jeffrey Price, of Talladega's faculty, was about to move on to Tuskegee where he was taking a position in that school's new Department of Philosophy. Tuskegee had a new department:--

Philosophy! Here was a potential connection possibly making itself! It was necessary simply to move along with it and see if it wanted to be what we hoped it might be. Barankin informed Woodruff of the news by letter and suggested talking together about it at the Statewide meeting of the Committee which was to be held soon in San Diego and to which Woodruff had been invited. Those conversations were held and resulted in mutual agreement to approach Tuskegee. It was toward the end of that year that a next visit to Tuskegee could be foreseen and B. D. Mayberry's good offices were directly solicited to put us in touch with the new philosophy department. (Mayberry, who was Dean of the School of Agriculture when we first came to know Tuskegee, subsequently became Vice President for Development. Just recently he left the Vice Presidency to assume the post of Dean of the School of Applied Sciences.) Barankin was at Tuskegee in the first days of January, 1972, and he consulted with Philosophy Department members Brooke Hamilton and Jeffrey Price. (Chairman Joseph De Marco was away at a meeting.) Both were enthusiastic about the potential value in a relationship with Philosophy-Irvine, and this was the crucial news that could be relayed to Woodruff a few days later. From that time things have rolled. By hearty agreement all around, the first visit to take place was that of A. I. Melden to Tuskegee. Melden is a senior member of Irvine's Department of Philosophy and, in association with the Council for Philosophical Studies, is intimately concerned with promoting the welfare of philosophy, especially in the smaller educational institutions. Melden is evidently just the man for such a concern: it was a most fulfilling visit he made to Tuskegee in March. Over a period of several days he participated closely in the activities of the Tuskegee department, and he arrived at a number of explicit understandings with the men there on how their two departments could benefit each other. Plans are now going forward for a visit in the reverse direction, and we anticipate there will be a great deal of accomplishment to be seen in this relationship straight into the future. ("Straight into the future" is language that stresses our own view that it is a process that has here been wrought, not a point-achievement. The persons involved appear to have "hit it off" with each other, and the commitments made go deep and pertain to the long run. Our Program has mediated in the initiation of a new process; that process will now go its way, not doing our tasks or anyone else's, but developing its own beneficial educational ideas and activities as it goes. How much more vigorously it will live, being itself!

How much more it will create as its own potential blossoms forth, than if it were constrained to be a tool of others' potential!)

One of the Committee's "charter members," Larzer Ziff, paid a visit of a few days this year to Tuskegee. When Barankin was at Tuskegee in January 1972 he found intensive activity under way to set up a so-called "common freshman year" program. In talking about this with Thomas M. Curran (English) and John G. Tryon (Engineering), and with Edward L. Jackson (Vice President for Academic Affairs), he noted that the program envisaged was to be in the same spirit as the freshman studies program at Miles College, although going much further. (Tuskegee has a technical and professional side that is not present in the Miles make-up.) In response to the urgent concern of the involved Tuskegee people about the effective structuring of such a freshman program, and about finding a director for it, it was natural for Barankin to suggest that it might be very useful to their deliberations to have Ziff spend a few days there talking with them. For, it was Ziff who was instrumental in conceiving and launching the freshman studies program at Miles back in 1964. (See our Annual Report for 1964-65.) Ziff came forward willingly and eagerly to do this and he went to Tuskegee in March.

Our preceding Annual Report told of the very productive, and much appreciated, visit of E. D. Lawson to Tougaloo in April of 1970, where he spent a devoted week assisting the psychologists there in launching a psychology major. Lawson--a past chairman of his Department of Psychology at New York State University College in Fredonia, and whose experience includes other department building--came to bat again this year, this time for Cheyney State College. Lawson spent an intensive day on the Cheyney campus in October with Samuel W. Winslow and his department, and followed that by arranging for Winslow to visit, in November, the Department of Psychology at Fredonia and the Department of Human Relations at the State University in nearby Buffalo. Lawson's colleagues Hess (who is currently Chairman) and Lehr figured prominently in Winslow's consultations in Fredonia, as did Adrian Solomon at Buffalo, Chairman of the department there. This set of visits, in both directions, contributed exceedingly to Cheyney-Psychology's getting on top of its organizational problems. Winslow, like Rose Branch at Tougaloo the year before, could not find enough superlatives to adequately describe Lawson's contribution.

This case offers another good example of the tremendous power for accomplishment there is in our Program's structure and way of doing things. It

would have been a formidable path for Cheyney-Psychology to take, even had the urgency not been there to make it near to impossible--the path of deciding and proceeding to seek and formally engage professional cooperation in departmental development. But the ease of interpersonal communication that is stressed in our Program and is constantly being created, and the network of concerned academic people that our activities have built up (and continue to build)--these qualities of ours made it possible to slice cleanly through to a fulfilling experience. In detail, what happened was this: Barankin had stopped off at Cheyney in September of 1971 to talk with Winslow among others. Winslow was one of the first Cheyney people he had come to know, and since their first meeting--in December, 1969--they have been looking to developing a functioning association. This present visit, in September 1971, was to try to pull some plans together. Barankin found Winslow, however, too deeply involved with very immediate questions to permit talking about more long-range ideas. In the course of conversation it emerged that these immediate questions would find answers much sooner if a good experienced head could join in the deliberations. Barankin mentioned Lawson and then telephoned to him right then and there from Winslow's office. With the handing of the telephone over to Winslow a couple of minutes later there began the Lawson-Winslow asosication that has been retailed above.

Our persistence, in spite of every difficulty and every trend of the times, in searching for new names to add to our rolls--this constancy is always rewarded, and it is particularly well-rewarded when it brings someone like Karen Morell, of the University of Washington, into our activities. Morell teaches African Literature at Seattle and is associated with the Office of Minority Affairs on that campus. Her participation with us is a bridge to a very important corner of the country; and this year, in May, she began putting down the paving over that bridge with a visit to Howard University. She made contacts there not only with Howard faculty--including Stephen E. Henderson--but with a number of black teachers and scholars from other schools who were attending the Black Caucus at Howard the week she was there. Morell has stressed a number of avenues of potentially very productive cooperation, and we expect to see these develop over the future.

Of the members of our Committee, Harry Morrison is again among the travelers this year. Warren E. Henry, Chairman of the Physics Department at Howard University, writes of the value of Morrison's visits, particularly in his direct contacts with the students there.

Another visitor emanated from the Berkeley campus to Howard University this year. William H. Sherrill, Berkeley's Admissions Officer, spent a couple of days in November with Howard's administrative staff looking at their admissions procedures. This visit, by the way, was motivated by a letter from a man whose name has appeared too little in our reports since its appearance in 1965; that is, Andrew Billingsley, who is now Howard University's Vice President for Academic Affairs.

It is time to give a special nod of recognition to Faye Goldberg, Chairman of Psychology at Morehouse College, for her steadiness in bringing for brief visits to Morehouse each year some prominent black psychologists. She tells of important lasting effects of these visits directly on her students: precious motivation and new associations into the graduate world and future. We're guessing, too, that Goldberg may always have one eye on the possibility that one of these valuable visitors will elect to join the Morehouse faculty. A perfectly valid use of an eye! The recruiting problem for the black colleges is still a tough one. But with such a program of visitors as Goldberg's, that problem will be resolved all the sooner; for, the pool of potential black faculty members will increase that much sooner. This year two outstanding men spent several days at the Department of Psychology in Atlanta. Jerome Taylor, who is Director of the Clinical Psychology Center at the University of Pittsburgh, was there in February; and Ewart Thomas, of the Department of Psychology at the University of Michigan, visited in March. The magnitude of the encounter is revealed by Goldberg's comment that they "made a lasting impression on our faculty, students and curriculum."

Our Committee's pocketbook did a small good turn this year, in response to a request from Warren Henry--the kind of thing we can do with warrant and ease from time to time and which helps so much at the receiving end. We contributed $100 to assist Howard University's Physics Department in moving the recently acquired 36" Infrared Telescope to their property in Beltsville, Maryland. This telescope was a gift to Howard from NASA, and is expected to add a great deal to their program in astrophysics.

Process in Course

Readers of our Annual Reports will have discerned, already in the pages up to this point, a new flavor in this present report. What accounts for it is our effort now to start to convey in explicit terms the meaning--the nature and the implications--of our approach to human and social development. Through these several years of our existence we have been steadily putting forth our concept in synthetic-descriptive and in hortatory terms. We have enough history now to be able to begin to elaborate that concept also analytically and in terms of its actual accomplishments.

Our concept is process (--to put it in one word and leave aside a myriad of structural details for future discussion and understanding). We implement the initiation of interpersonal processes that have promise of great productivity for the over-all educational process, and we strive to nurture and abet these processes into the indefinite future, which is "where" their endless productivity evolutionally lies. We want, now and henceforth, to get this across to our readers by citing examples of actual happenings in "our processes"--not citing them, however, simply as things-in-themselves, but elaborating them in context, in the context of the process of which they are a part. It is only when that is done that there is instruction in the correct dynamics of the achievement of desired goals.

We're going to start easy this year, with only one more example in addition to what we have already presented in the preceding pages. The "space-time-point" "thing-in-itself" reportage on the example we want to cite is this: the Natural Sciences Division of Tougaloo College was successful in obtaining a National Science Foundation grant as a consequence of the COSIP proposal they submitted following the visit to their campus of Henry C. McBay and Bernard A. Gelbaum back in January of 1970. (See our Annual Report for 1969-70.) That's the isolated fact. Now, let's look at this fact in a way that makes us understand how it came about, and makes clear that our SCDCNCU Program deals crucially in exactly this dynamics. When Barankin visited the Tougaloo campus in November of 1969, among the large number of dedicated, hard-working people he met was John B. Garner, Professor of Physics and Chairman of the Division of Natural Sciences. Garner and his colleagues were at that time deeply involved in their disappointment at having had their recent COSIP proposal turned down, and in endeavoring to put together a new, better

one. Barankin and Garner discussed these matters, with a frank view toward seeing how, if at all, our SCDCNCU Program could be helpful with the new proposal. One idea was fairly immediate in coming: Gelbaum, who was Professor of Mathematics and Dean of Natural Sciences at the Irvine campus of the University of California, was already making preparations to visit Tougaloo, at the invitation of Ernest Borinski of Tougaloo's Social Sciences Division. Gelbaum had had experience as a reviewer of proposals, and thus it would be useful to have him consult with Garner and colleagues when he arrived. But then, in the course of Garner and Barankin thinking and talking together, something else occurred. They chanced to look over the list of the preceding year's successful applicants for COSIP grants. And there on the list was Henry McBay, with a grant for his Department of Chemistry at Morehouse. It was Barankin's immediate reaction to observe to Garner that the combination of McBay's name on that list and his (Barankin's) personal acquaintance with McBay and his broad and extensive activities in science and science administration at the Atlanta University Center--this combination left no doubt that McBay could be of immense consultative help immediately at Tougaloo, as well as becoming a long-term friend. And Barankin observed further that because of McBay's dedication to education and his sympathy and identification with the efforts of our Program in behalf of educational enhancement, he would surely, on being asked, be willing to share his competence with Tougaloo if he could arrange the time away. The rest of the story is now straightforward. McBay did agree willingly to this undertaking, and went to some trouble about it, arranging a leave of absence from a commitment he was involved in at the University of Minnesota at the time. He and Gelbaum were further agreeable to adjusting their schedules so as to be at Tougaloo at the same time, to make their joint effort the more effective for Tougaloo. Their visit came to pass, as we have said, in January of 1970.

That is (some of) what happened up to January, 1970, in the SCDCNCU-Tougaloo process. In that January all the good heads came together and Tougaloo submitted a new proposal to N. S. F. And later in that process the proposal was found to be deserving and was funded.

The (Immediate!) Future

On the subject of the future, the foremost question before us now is whether or not there will be one. It is a matter of our passing to a new source of funding. Ours has been a most fortunate and a most favored program through its first eight years of existence to the present: we have had the constant unstinting support, both financial and moral, of the Field Foundation. It is time now for that foundation to move its resources on to its new generations of significant works--and so it is time for the support of our long-term project to be taken up by others. It is a long-term project that we are about, and this is to be stressed. We are occupied in showing--moreover in vivo, not merely in vitro--that (2) the flow of life consists basically in process, not basically in animated mass points; and that therefore (1) the achievement of desired goals is to be sought more surely by initiating and maintaining the processes within which these goals may actualize, and is not as soundly sought by planning deterministic trajectories of human activity. Our first eight years have produced a wealth of results bearing witness to these affirmations. We can now begin to elaborate all this evidence (as indeed we have explicitly begun to do in the above pages) and then go on to its implication of more and more valuable and important accomplishment. Initiation and maintenance of process do not--cannot--make the constant demands of deadline that deterministic planning does. If the process and its benefits are the goal, one cannot then necessarily have also all one's heart's desire in the way of minimal or prescribed sidereal time periods. Therein lies the reason for the "long-term" character of our Program. And over this "long-term" we expect to show convincingly that it is the human process, not the human projectile, that will find the mark of full minority intellectual emergence and flowering.

Our funds from the Field Foundation will run to the end of calendar 1973. We are seeking other foundation commitments to carry us on from there. We have various ideas and plans for new directions into the future, which we will begin to implement just as soon as we are assured of funding. One of the principal ones of these is the plan (already noted earlier in this report) to create an East Coast branch, or counterpart, of our Berkeley-centered Committee. The idea is, furthermore, that as well as being East, as against West, the new Committee should also be predominantly black, as against predominantly white. We are at a stage of development now, in terms of numbers of individuals and numbers of associations, where it is possible to think and attempt such activities. And if successful they can be tremendous boosts to our own Program and valuable instruction to others in other endeavors.

This report is respectfully submitted by the Committee:

Herbert Blumer, Sociology
Boris Bresler, SESM
Doris Calloway,
Nutritional Sciences
Edwin M. Epstein,
Business Administration
Watson M. Laetsch, Botany
(Vice Chairman)
Gordon Mackinney,
Nutritional Sciences
Harry Morrison, Physics
Yasundo Takahashi,
Mechanical Design
Staten W. Webster, Education
Edward W. Barankin, Statistics
(Chairman)

November 15, 1972

Appendix

Visits during 1971-72

Name	Field	Home Institution	Schools and Institutions Visited	Dates
Mildred Alexander	Social Welfare	UC-Berkeley	Talladega College Tuskegee Institute	May 7-11 1972
Edward W. Barankin	Statistics	UC-Berkeley	Cheyney State College Temple University Howard University National Science Foundation	Sept 19-26 1971
			D.-Q. University, Davis	Nov 16 1971
			Harvard University Yale University City College of N.Y.	Nov 17-23 1971
			University of Washington	Dec 10-13 1971
			Morehouse College Tuskegee Institute	Dec 31- Jan 5, 1972
			Miami University Shaw University Washington, D. C.	Mar 22- Apr 1, 1972
			UC-Irvine and UCLA	May 2-3 1972
John W. Cotton	Education	UC-Santa Barbara	D.-Q. University, Davis	May 23 1972
Gordon K. Davies	Administration	Stockton State College, Pomona, N.J.	Asilomar SCDCNCU Retreat	Mar 10-13 1972
George A. Ferguson	Nuclear Engineering	Howard University	Asilomar SCDCNCU Retreat	Mar 10-13 1972
Mrs. Neal Goodwin	Hospital Dietetics	Tuskegee Institute	University of Missouri	Dec 5-7 1971
James H. M. Henderson	Biology	Tuskegee Institute	Asilomar SCDCNCU Retreat	Mar 9-14 1972

Appendix continued

Name	Field	Home Institution	Schools and Institutions Visited	Dates
Lillie Hicks	Home Economics and Food Administration	Tuskegee Institute	Medical Dietetics Conference, Columbus, Ohio	May 3-5 1972
Tobe Johnson	Political Science	Morehouse College	Asilomar SCDCNCU Retreat	Mar 10-13 1972
E. D. Lawson	Psychology	N.Y. State University College, Fredonia, N.Y.	Cheyney State College	Oct 6-7 1971
Gordon Mackinney	Nutritional Sciences	UC-Berkeley	Asilomar SCDCNCU Retreat	Mar 11-12 1972
A. I. Melden	Philosophy	UC-Irvine	Tuskegee Institute	Feb 27-Mar 3, 1972
Karen Morell	Minority Affairs	University of Washington	Howard University	May 21-27 1972
Harry Morrison	Physics	UC-Berkeley	Howard University	Oct 20-22 1971
			Asilomar SCDCNCU Retreat	Mar 11-12 1972
Johnnie W. Prothro	Home Economics and Food Administration	Tuskegee Institute	University of Missouri	Dec 5-7 1971
William H. Sherrill	Administration	UC-Berkeley	Howard University	Nov 10-12 1971
Doris Jackson Smith	Social Welfare	UC-Berkeley	Talladega College Tuskegee Institute	May 5-14 1972
Jerome Taylor	Psychology	University of Pittsburgh	Morehouse College	Feb 22-25 1972
Ewart Thomas	Psychology	University of Michigan	Morehouse College	Mar 5-8 1972
Bernadine Tolbert	Home Economics and Food Administration	Tuskegee Institute	UC-Berkeley	June 9-19 1971
Samuel W. Winslow	Psychology	Cheyney State College	N.Y. State University College, Fredonia, N.Y.	Nov 16-17 1971
Larzer Ziff	English	UC-Berkeley	Tuskegee Institute	Mar 1-4 1972